

REMARKS

The above listing of the claims replaces all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the proposed amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claim Status

Claims 1-10, 17-18, 22-26 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102; and

Claims 11-16 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103;

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

The rejection of claims 1-10, 17-18 and 22-26 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Tabata et al. (USP 6,537,324) (hereinafter Tabata), is traversed.

On page 6, the Examiner has stated that Tabata discloses a copying machine (470) with a scanner unit and a printer unit integrated into one device and quotes column 23, lines 10-12 as supporting this position. The Examiner then states that “the scanner unit of the copier reads information on a medium form (420) and the printer unit of the copier prints out received information” (emphasis added) Column 23, lines 56-63 and column 24, lines 36-38 are cited in support of the position taken with respect to integration.

However, if the position is that the “integration” results in one device (viz., a unit), which is the clear tenor of the rejection and the resulting basis of the admonishment of the Applicant re this issue (see below) - how is the Examiner’s position that the scanner unit reads information and the printer unit prints the same – justified? If the position with respect to the “integration” holds there cannot be a scanner “unit” and a printer “unit” but one device which is itself a unit.

The rejection therefore brings itself undone by stating on the record that the copy device comprises a scanner “unit” and a printer “unit.” This defeats the Examiner’s position that integration does more than just arrange the two units “in the same box” and renders the admonishment that “it is erroneous for the Applicant to conveniently disregard Tabata’s disclosure and state that irrespective of integration, the scanner and the printer are different devices” in question. This admonishment cannot be justified because the rejection itself refers to the units as being different units or devices.

The remaining refutations which are set forth on pages 6 and 7 are deemed equally untenable. For example, the statements that Tabata discloses identifying a file server "reads" on determination whether the network (viz., the whole system) is enabled, is strained to the point of being indefensible. Just how this "reading" is justified is not advanced and would appear as untenable as the above "integration" position.

In this response, the claims have been amended to make it clear that the claimed printer per se is, in accordance with claim 1, such as to:

- 1) receive print stream data adapted to contain a network address;
- 2) determine whether a URL or external network option is enabled;
- 3) detect if a network address is in the received data;
- 4) send on the Internet or other network, an access request to an administrative control entity separate and distinct from a user entity instigating the print stream data, for a document to the network address;
- 5) retrieve the document from the network address in the instance the administrative control entity grants the access request;
- 6) merge the document from the network address into the print stream data to form a modified document; and
- 7) print the modified document.

It is submitted that the printer "unit" of Tabata et al. is totally incapable of performing the above listed functions nor any of the combination of steps listed in the other pending independent claims. The rejection of claims 1-10, 17-18 and 22-26 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Tabata et al. (USP 6,537,324), is therefore respectfully traversed.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103

The rejection of claims 11-14 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being anticipated by Tabata et al. in view of Russell et al. is traversed. This rejection falls with the fall of the anticipation rejection of claim 1.

In addition, there is nothing in any of the secondary reference to Russel et al. to suggest that the printer "unit" of Tabata et al. (as clearly defined by the Examiner on page 6 of this Office Action), could be induced to perform the steps recited in the above mentioned claims.

It is also pointed out that there must be reason for the hypothetical person of ordinary skill to consider the "integration" of the printer and scanner into a single device to render it reasonable to consider the printer being able to perform the functions of the scanner and vice versa. The rejection, as it stands, fails completely to establish any rational reason why the hypothetical person of ordinary skill would deem this situation to come into existence as a result of the intergration mentioned at column 23, lines 10-12 of Tabata.

The rejections of claims 15 and 16 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabata et al. in view of Wolff, and the seemingly redundant rejection of claims 19-21 under 35 USC § in view of the very same combination of references, are respectfully traversed on at least the same grounds as the rejection of claims 11-14. There is nothing in any of the secondary references to suggest that the printer "unit" of Tabata et al., could be induced to perform the combination of steps recited in pending independent claims let alone claims 15-16 and 19-21.

Conclusion

It is submitted that the above amendments place this application in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration of the newly presented claims along with those amended, are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874

Keith J. Townsend
Registration No. 40,358

Date: March 31, 2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Customer No.: 022879